UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,613	07/11/2006	Seiichiro Miyahara	DK-US065158	8526
	7590 06/01/201 OUNSELORS, LLP		EXAMINER	
1233 20TH STI	REET, NW, SUITE 70		BOWERS, NATHAN ANDREW	
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-2680			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/01/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/585,613	MIYAHARA, SEIICHIRO	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	NATHAN A. BOWERS	1797						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>14 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as					
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor 			cause					
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bethe appeal; and/or 	•	lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for					
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of					
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).					
10.	n of the status of the claims after er	try is below or attach	ed.					
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>022210</u>							
	/Nathan A Bowers/ Examiner, Art Unit 1797							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 involving Barbera-Guillem has been considered but is not persuasive.

Applicant's principle arguments are

(a) Claim 1 of the present application requires a plurality of temperature control devices in communication with each other. In Figure 91, Barbera-Guillem merely discloses a plurality of cell culture cassettes in communication with each other.

In response, please consider the following remarks.

The claims define each "temperature control device" as comprising a cassette, a heating mechanism, a cooling mechanism, a temperature setting unit, and a heating-and-cooling control unit. Figure 91 and paragraphs [0326]-[0328] of Barbera-Guillem indicate that a plurality of these temperature control devices are in communication when assembled within a communication unit 1000. Each cassette 100, 830 is coupled to a heating/cooling mechanism in the form of a conductor plate 1070 and Peltier element 1060. Paragraph [0327] further indicates that each cassette is in communication with a temperature sensor 1080 and a control unit 1055 provided within the communication unit. Accordingly, Barbera-Guillem does disclose a plurality of independent "temperature control devices" in communication with each other and connected to each other within the communication unit. Even if the "temperature control devices" of Barbera-Guillem do not include independent and discrete elements, it is additionally noted that the claims of the instant invention are broad and read on an arrangement in which certain individual elements (such as the heating mechanism, cooling mechanism, control unit, etc.) of connected temperature control devices are mutually shared.